

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawing on the grounds that they include reference characters not mentioned in the description. Specifically, the Examiner has identified reference numeral 3 in FIG. 3 as not being included in the Specification. This rejection is not correct because there is no reference numeral 3 in FIG. 3. Reference numerals 28, 30, 30a, 32 and 30a are the only numerals appearing in FIG. 3 and all of these numbers are mentioned in paragraphs 27 and 28 of the Specification. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner's letter contained a reminder with regard to proper language for the Abstract and the applicant has carefully reviewed its Abstract and can confirm that it is in complete compliance with the Office guidelines in this regard.

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under Section 112 of the statute because there was not proper antecedent basis for the phrase "overlap the edge". Applicant agrees with this point and has amended Claim 1 so as to eliminate the language "overlap the edge" and instead substitute "provide excess material". This has necessitated a slight additional change in Claim 1 to refer to "said excess material." It is believed this Amendment completely overcomes the Section 112 rejection.

In consideration of the rejection under Section 103 of the statute on the basis of the Papadakis and Davis references is requested. It is settled law that a rejection for obviousness is proper only if there is some overall teaching or suggestion to justify combining references. There is no such teaching or suggestion in the prior art of record. The Davis reference teaches applying a decorative laminate to a structure, but offers no suggestion whatsoever that this

technology is applicable to model cars where the decorative sheet would be of a size to envelope the car and provide excess material. This is a specific limitation of the present applicant's claims.

While Papadakis teaches a method of applying laminate to various surfaces including model cars, it does not teach a method of using a sheet holding a transferable image which is of a size to envelope the entire model car and overlap the edges. Thus, there is no reference which suggests combining Papadakis and Davis and even if there was, the resulting combination would not result in a method meeting the limitations of the present applicant's claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that there is no proper grounds for an obviousness rejection of Claims 1-7 and therefore this rejection should be withdrawn. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

J. David Wharton, Reg. No. 25,717
STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP
1201 Walnut, Suite 2800
Kansas City, MO 64106-2150
Telephone: (816) 842-8600
Facsimile: (816) 691-3495